

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 35 and 82 are the two remaining independent claims in this application. Each includes a limitation neither disclosed by, nor made obvious in view of, the prior art.

The Office Action states at page 3, lines 6-7, that Matz shows an “electrical cable 82 running along a length of the conduit 122 (see figure 6)”. However, applicant’s invention as recited in claim 35 is not directed to an “electrical cable” but to a cable that is “electrically coupled to the sensors for transferring the signals to a destination.” The signals that are transferred are signals “used to control conveyance of the substance to the plants”.

Matz’ “electrical cable 82” does not convey signals “used to control conveyance of the substance to the plants.” Rather, Matz’ electrical cable only provides power to lamps for illumination. “[E]lectrical wiring 82 . . . may be used for the attachment of illumination devices such as edging lamp 90.” Matz at col. 8, lines 14-16. “The lamp 96 may be wired in series shown by wires 82 . . .” Matz at col. 8, lines 29-30. Thus, Matz teaches away from a cable that transfers “signals from the sensors” since Matz only discloses using the cables to provide power to lights.

It should be noted that the “sensor 482” of Matz that is described in the Office Action is not a sensor of a type that generates signals that can be transferred. This sensor 482 is of a known type that connects between a light to be controlled and the electrical wires so that the sensor can switch the light on or off at the point where the light is connected to the electrical cable. “Fig. 20 sets forth an optional sensor 482 that may be inserted into the illumination lamp coupling . . .”. Matz at col. 10, lines 56-58. Thus, claim 35 is neither disclosed nor made obvious by the prior art.

Claim 82 recites “a plurality of sensors fixedly coupled to the conduit, wherein each sensor includes a wireless transmitter for transmitting a signal to a central controller for controlling dispensing of a material via the outlet in response to the transmitted signals.” Applicant has already argued the limitations of claim 82 in view of the prior art, particularly Iggyulden, in the prior Amendment. Applicant can not find any rebuttal, argument or reason for rejecting claim 82 in the present Office Action. The only mention of claim 82 in the present Office Action states that “[c]laims 35-53, 77-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall, III in view of Iggyulden et al. and Matz” (see Office Action at page 2, first line of part 4) and then at page 4, part 6 which states “[a]pplicant’s arguments with respect to claims 77-43, 77-82 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.” Matz does not disclose any wireless transmitter or signal of any kind

and the present Office Action does not reveal how Matz contributes in any way to disclosing or making obvious the “wireless” limitations in claim 82.

Since Applicant's prior arguments regarding claim 82 and Iggulden do not appear to have been addressed they are repeated in the following paragraph:

Iggulden does not disclose or make obvious wireless transmission of sensor data to a “central controller”. In Iggulden, each wireless transmission from a sensor is sent only to one associated valve. “Where there are a plurality of valves connected to the timer controller means in the wireless version, there are identification code recognition means included within the receiver means disposed for disabling only the valve associated with an identification code . . .”. Iggulden at col. 4, lines 13-17. Thus each sensor's data is used to control only one valve. In this respect Iggulden teaches away from the present invention's approach of sending data from a plurality of sensors to a central controller.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number below at the Examiner's convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Trellis Intellectual Property Law Group, PC

By _____/Charles J. Kulas/_____
Charles J. Kulas
Reg. No. 35,809
Tel.: 415-279-5098